



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,528	10/26/2002	Carl Michael Dennison	BLD920010032	2146
33595	7590	03/15/2006	EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION 9000 SOUTH RITA ROAD TUCSON, AZ 85744			HUNTSINGER, PETER K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/065,528	Applicant(s) DENNISON ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter K. Huntsinger	Art Unit 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the amendment, the objection to claim 4 has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-42 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 15-20, and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. Publication US 2002,0080402 and Hansen Patent 6,509,974.

Referring to claims 1, 15, and 29, Robinson et al. disclose a method comprising the steps: creating a first job ticket describing print instructions applicable to a print source file (individual ticket of Fig. 1, page 5, paragraph 64); creating at least one additional job ticket describing different print instructions applicable to the print source file (individual ticket of Fig. 1, page 5, paragraph 64); and storing each job ticket (264 of Fig. 4, page 6, paragraph 86). Robinson et al. disclose applying a global instruction to

Art Unit: 2624

each of the job tickets (page 5, paragraph 76); and updating the job tickets applicable to the print source file in response to applying a global instruction (step 214 of Fig. 2, page 5, paragraph 73) (step 222 of Fig. 2, page 6, paragraph 76). Robinson et al. do not disclose expressly altering a page in the print source file. Hansen teaches applying a global instruction includes altering at least one page in a print source file (page 6, lines 52-55). Robinson et al. and Hansen are combinable because they are from the same field of printing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to alter a page in a print source file utilizing a global instruction. The motivation for doing so would have been to avoid having to parse and rebuild a PDL file if changes are desired (Robinson et al., page 3, paragraph 34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hansen with Robinson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 15, and 29.

Referring to claims 2, 16, and 30, Robinson et al. disclose the method according to claim 1 wherein the operations of creating at least one additional job ticket comprises creating a plurality of additional job tickets (individual tickets of Fig. 4, page 6, paragraph 86).

Referring to claims 3, 17, and 31, Robinson et al. disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the operations of creating the first job ticket and the at least one additional job ticket are performed using a visual job ticketing application (page 5, paragraph 67).

Referring to claims 4, 5, 18, 19, 32, and 33, Hansen discloses wherein altering the print source file comprises moving, inserting, or deleting at least one page in the print source file (col. 6, lines 45-49). Robinson et al. disclose wherein updating the job

Art Unit: 2624

tickets comprises automatically amending the print instructions of the first job ticket and of the at least one additional job ticket to account for the alteration of the print source file (step 214 of Fig. 2, page 5, paragraph 73) (step 222 of Fig. 2, page 6, paragraph 76).

Referring to claims 6, 20, and 34, Robinson et al. disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the operation of storing each job ticket comprises storing an indication of which job ticket was last active with respect to the first print job (page 5, paragraph 73) (page 6, paragraph 86). Robinson et al. disclose that after a ticket is activated, the master ticket is marked. The last ticket to be activated would be stored last on the marked list within the master ticket. Furthermore, the print tickets when activated are viewed as separate jobs to the system, which would maintain an order of the tickets (page 5, paragraph 69).

5. Claims 7-14, 21-28, and 35-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. Publication US 2002,0080402 Hansen Patent 6,509,974 as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Suzuki et al. U.S. Patent 5,923,013.

Referring to claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 35, and 36, Hansen disclose altering the at least one page in the first print source file (page 6, lines 52-55). Robinson et al. disclose automatically amending the print instructions of the first job ticket and of the at least one additional job ticket applicable to the first print source file to account for the alteration of the first print source file (step 214 of Fig. 2, page 5, paragraph 73) (step 222 of Fig. 2, page 6, paragraph 76). Robinson et al. do not disclose expressly importing a page from

a second print job into the first print job. Suzuki et al. disclose importing at least one page from a second print source file into the first print source file (Fig. 26, col. 15, lines 7-13); and choosing to retain the print characteristics of the at least one imported page as defined in a job ticket associated with the second print source file (Fig. 50, col. 23, lines 32-44). Robinson et al. and Suzuki et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of managing print job description files. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to retain the print characteristics of a second print job page imported into a first print job described by print tickets. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to specify whether a description file of a print job or a description file of an inserted page should be used to specify the characteristics of the inserted page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki et al. with Robinson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 35, and 36.

Referring to claims 9, 10, 23, 24, 37, and 38, Hansen disclose altering the at least one page in the first print source file (page 6, lines 52-55). Robinson et al. disclose automatically amending the print instructions of the first job ticket and of the at least one additional job ticket applicable to the first print source file to account for the alteration of the first print source file (step 214 of Fig. 2, page 5, paragraph 73) (step 222 of Fig. 2, page 6, paragraph 76). Robinson et al. do not disclose expressly importing a page from a second print job into the first print job. Suzuki et al. disclose importing at least one page from a second print source file into the first print source file (Fig. 26, col. 15, lines 7-13); and receiving selection to assign a default set of print characteristics to the at

least one imported page corresponding to a set of document-wide print characteristics defined in a currently active job ticket associated with the first print job (Fig. 51, col. 23, lines 45-54). Robinson et al. and Suzuki et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of managing print job description files. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to amend the print characteristics of a second print job page imported into a first print job described by print tickets. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to specify whether a description file of a print job or a description file of an inserted page should be used to specify the characteristics of the inserted page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki et al. with Robinson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9, 10, 23, 24, 37, and 38.

Referring to claims 11, 13, 25, 27, 39, and 41, Robinson et al. disclose wherein the operation of creating at least one additional job ticket comprises: receiving selection of one of a set of selections comprising; loading a blank job ticket as the active job ticket applicable to her print source file (page 6, paragraph 80); loading a selected, previously-created job ticket as the active job ticket (page 6, paragraph 77); retaining the first job ticket as the active job ticket (224 of Fig. 3, page 6, paragraph 77) and editing the print characteristics of the active job ticket to create the at least one additional job ticket (page 6, paragraph 77). The active job ticket is represented as being the ticket of which the user is currently editing. Robinson et al. does not disclose expressly loading a default job ticket as the active job ticket. Suzuki et al. disclose loading a default job ticket as the active job ticket (Fig. 4, col. 7, lines 18-23). Robinson et al. and Suzuki et

al. are combinable because they are from the same field of managing print job description files. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to load default job ticket as the active ticket. The motivation for doing so would have been to designate a standard of which print characteristics to apply for a print ticket. Further, as disclosed by Robinson et al., checked boxes showing print characteristics must either be checked or unchecked. The settings that appear when create a new job ticket would clearly be a default setting. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki et al. with Robinson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11, 13, 25, 27, 39, and 41.

Referring to claim 12, 14, 26, 28, 40, and 42, Robinson et al. disclose wherein the editing operation is performed using a visual ticketing application (page 3, paragraph 38) to cause the display of the print source file using visual cues indicating the print characteristics denoted by the active job ticket, as edited (checked boxes of Fig. 1, page 5, paragraph 73).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2624

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter K. Huntsinger whose telephone number is (571)272-7435. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams can be reached on (571)272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PKH



KA Williams

KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 10/065,528
Art Unit: 2624

Page 9